

## **REMARKS**

Claims 23, 24, 26 – 32, and 34 – 38 are pending. Claims 23, 24, 26 – 32, and 34 – 38 are presently rejected. By this Amendment, independent claims 23 and 31 have been amended; and dependent claims 43 and 44 have been added. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

### **Interview Summary**

This Supplemental Amendment is made in connection with telephonic interviews of March 18, 2010 and March 23, 2010.

On March 18, 2010, Applicants conducted a telephonic interview with the Office regarding the above-identified application. The following individuals were present during the telephone conference.

Representing the Office: Examiner Arthur O. Hall.

Representing Applicants: Attorney of Record Larry M. Jarvis and Technical Specialist Dr. Mike Chan.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Hall for conducting the interview.

The Examiner initiated the interview to discuss the Response to Office action filed February 4, 2010. During the interview, the Examiner asked Applicants to explain the language in claim 23. Particularly, the Examiner asked Applicants to explain the elements of claim 23 including “each of the outcomes being either an integer having a positive value or a non-winning outcome,” “wherein a total number of the integers having a positive value in any one of the award sets is not equal to a total number of the integers having a positive value in any other of the award sets,” “wherein a sum total of the positive value for all integers in any one of the award sets is equal to a sum total of the positive value for all integers in any other of the award sets,” “displaying said designated award sets,” and “selecting on displayed award set.” Applicants thereafter described the above-identified elements with respect to the Specification

of present application. Applicants also expressed their opinion that claims 23 and 31 were not obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,776,711 (“Baerlocher”) because Baerlocher discloses randomly assigning an award set post selection by the player of a prize area. The Examiner agreed that claim 23 was not obvious in view of Baerlocher. The Examiner also indicated he would follow-up with another telephonic interview.

The Examiner suggested that “one of said total number of integers” be used in claim 23 instead of “a said integer,” as recited in claim 23. It was also suggested that dependent claims be made to further define “said total number of integers” to be “one.” Applicants agreed. No other agreement was made.

On March 23, 2010, Applicants conducted a telephonic interview with the Office regarding the above-identified application. The following individuals were present during the telephone conference.

Representing the Office: Examiner Arthur O. Hall.

Representing Applicants: Attorney of Record Larry M. Jarvis and Technical Specialist Mike Chan.

Applicants again would like to thank Examiner Hall for conducting the interview.

The Examiner initiated the interview to discuss the Response to Office action filed February 4, 2010 as a follow-up to the interview conducted on March 18, 2010. During the interview, the Examiner asked Applicants to explain the language in claim 23. Particularly, the Examiner asked Applicants to explain the elements of claim 23 including “award sets,” “non-winning outcome,” “operation of said one selector,” “selecting one displayed award set,” and “selecting an outcome.”

The Examiner indicated that the present pending claims would be placed in an allowable condition if rewritten to further define the above-identified elements. The Examiner suggested defining “award sets” to include “each of said award sets having at least one of said outcomes being an integer of positive value.” The Examiner also suggested defining “non-winning

outcome” to “having no value.” The Examiner further suggested amending “operation of said one selector” and “selecting one displayed award set” to “selecting one of said displayed designated award sets ... in response to player operation of said one selector.” The Examiner also suggested preceding “selecting an outcome” with “after said selecting one of said displayed designated award sets.” Applicants agreed.

The Examiner also suggested making similar amendments to claim 31, and file the amendment in a Supplemental Amendment. Applicants agreed.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 23, 24, 26 – 32, 34 –38, 43 and 44 are allowable. In the event that the Examiner believes a telephone interview with the undersigned Applicants’ Representatives would be helpful in advancing prosecution of this patent application, the undersigned is available for telephone consultation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 24, 2010

/Larry M. Jarvis/  
Larry M. Jarvis  
Reg. No. 27,341

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 W. Madison Street  
34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Phone (312) 775-8000  
Fax (312) 775-8100